

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | |
|--|---|
| Serial No. 10/584,096 Application of: Rodolfo Verzegnassi and Thomas Aimon Filed: June 22, 2006 Attorney Docket No. FR030158 For: DATA RECEIVER HAVING MEANS FOR MINIMIZING INTERFERENCE AND METHOD USED IN SUCH A RECEIVER | Confirmation No.: 1407 Art Unit: 2618 Examiner: Ping Y. Hsieh Customer No.: 25235 |
|--|---|

INTERVIEW SUMMARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH 37 CFR 1.133

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

On 17 December, 2009 at approximately 9:00 AM MST a telephonic interview was conducted between Michael C. Martensen on behalf of the Applicant, and Examiner Ping Y. Hsieh of the USPTO. United States Patent Application No. 10/584,096, which is undergoing examination by Mr. Hsieh, was reviewed. In the interview, the merits of the Examiner's previous rejections with respect to U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0028121 by Fitton and the independent claims were assessed as was the Examiner's objections to the drawings.

A proposed set of amended drawings was submitted to the Examiner providing additional annotations to various objects shown in each Figure. An agreement was reached that the proposed annotations, if presented in compliance with the MPEP, would alleviate his objection.

The interview continued with a discussion of the teachings of Fitton and in particular Figure 9 of Fitton. In a previous response, the Applicant argued that Fitton does not show the use of correlators to aid in the removal of interferences as claimed. The Examiner argues that Figure 9 indeed does show correlators

and thus dismissed the argument. It was advanced by the Applicant that Fitton shows the use of correlators as an unscrambling means to aid in the removal of interferences consistent with the other teachings of Fitton. The claim, however, specifies that the correlators are placed prior to the interference subtraction means and evaluates the contribution of the interferences of scrambled codes. The Examiner agreed that the teachings of Figure 9 of Fitton and its associated text in the specification are inconsistent with the claimed invention.

The Applicant also suggested that the argument made by the Examiner with respect to Figure 6 was in error. The Examiner argued in the last response that despreding (as shown in Figure 6) is the equivalent of unscrambling (as claimed by the Applicant) and thus anticipated the invention. However, the Applicant presented in the interview definitions of unscrambling, despreding and respreading as would be known to one skilled in the art and argued that Figure 6 of Fitton was consistent with the other teachings (and Figures) of Fitton in that the interference was subtracted or cancelled post unscrambling and is distinct from the invention. The Examiner agreed and asked that the Applicant provide such definitions in the next response for his consideration.

The Interview ended at approximately 9:30 MST on 17 December, 2009. No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Q. Martensen, No. 46,901
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5910 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax

25 Nov, 2010